arXiv:1509.08641v1 [math.NA] 29 Sep 2015

A WEAK GALERKIN FINITE ELEMENT SCHEME WITH BOUNDARY CONTINUITY FOR SECOND-ORDER ELLIPTIC PROBLEMS

QILONG ZHAI*, XIU YE†, RUISHU WANG‡, AND RAN ZHANG§

Abstract. A new weak Galerkin (WG) finite element method for solving the second-order elliptic problems on polygonal meshes by using polynomials of boundary continuity is introduced and analyzed. The WG method is utilizing weak functions and their weak derivatives which can be approximated by polynomials in different combination of polynomial spaces. Different combination gives rise to different weak Galerkin finite element methods, which makes WG methods highly flexible and efficient in practical computation. This paper explores the possibility of certain combination of polynomial spaces that minimize the degree of freedom in the numerical scheme, yet without losing the accuracy of the numerical approximation. Error estimates of optimal order are established for the corresponding WG approximations in both a discrete H^1 norm and the standard L^2 norm. In addition, the paper also presents some numerical experiments to demonstrate the power of the WG method. The numerical results show a great promise of the robustness, reliability, flexibility and accuracy of the WG method.

Key words. weak Galerkin finite element methods, weak gradient, second-order elliptic equation, polygonal meshes.

AMS subject classifications. Primary, 65N30, 65N15, 65N12, 74N20; Secondary, 35B45, 35J50, 35J35

1. Introduction.

Nowadays, finite element methods (FEMs) are widely used in almost every field of engineering and industrial analysis. Since R. Courant [7] formulated the essence of what is now called a finite element in 1943, this method has been getting more and more attractive with the development of computers and is now recognized as one of the most versatile and powerful methods for approximating the solutions of boundary-value problems, especially for problems over complicated domains. Among the different finite elements methods, the conforming finite element method [18] with continuous, piecewise polynomial approximating spaces, has long been employed to approximate solutions for partial differential equations. Within the past few decades, however, a number of researchers have investigated Galerkin methods based on fully discontinuous approximating spaces, such as the discontinuous Galerkin (DG) methods [5, 1, 2, 3], the Hybridized discontinuous Galerkin (HDG) methods [6, 8], the weak Galerkin (WG) methods [19, 20], etc.

The WG method was first introduced in 2012 [19] for the second order elliptic problem and further developed with other applications, such as the Stokes, Helmholtz, Maxwell, biharmonic [13, 12, 9, 10, 17, 16, 19, 20, 23], etc. Its central idea is that

*Department of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun China

†Department of Mathematics, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Little Rock, AR 72204 (xxye@ualr.edu). The research of Ye was supported in part by National Science Foundation Grant DMS-1115097.

‡Department of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun China

§Department of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun, China (zhangran@mail.jlu.edu.cn). The research of Zhang was supported in part by China Natural National Science Foundation(11271157, 11371171, 11471141), and by the Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University of Ministry of Education of China.

the shape function in the interior of each element is simply polynomial. The weak finite element function could be totally discontinuous across elements. The continuity is compensated by the stabilizer through a suitable boundary integral defined on the boundary of elements. That is, we know more information on the shape function by sacrificing the continuity.

Comparing with the conforming FEMs, there are a lot of advantages for the discontinuous methods, for instance, high-order accuracy, multiphysics capability, the finite element partition can be of polygon or polyhedral type, the weak finite element space is easy to construct with any approximation requirement and suit for any given stability requirement. All of this, however, comes at a price: most notably through an increase in the total degrees of freedom (d.o.f.) as a direct result of the decoupling of the elements. For linear elements, this yields a doubling in the total number of degrees of freedom compared to the continuous FEM. For WG finite element methods, in order to reduce the d.o.f., people have made some efforts: in [14, 22], the possibility of optimal combination of polynomial spaces was explored to minimize the number of unknowns in the numerical scheme, yet without compromising the accuracy of the numerical approximation; in [22], some hybridization of finite element methods has been introduced by utilizing the Lagrange multiplier. The distinctive feature of the methods in this framework is that the only globally coupled degrees of freedom are those of an approximation of the solution defined only on the boundaries of the elements, then the global unknowns are the numerical traces of the field variables. Thus, one can reduce the number of the globally coupled degrees of freedom of WG methods.

The goal of this paper is to explore the possibility of certain combination of the polynomial spaces to reduce the number of unknowns without compromising the rate of convergence, which utilizes the boundary continuity for the WG finite element spaces. This idea is motivated by Chen [4] that was presented in ICIAM 2015. Combining with the Schur complement technique, we further eliminate the interior unknowns and produce a much reduced system of linear equations involving only the unknowns representing the interface variables. In fact, if we take the triangle mesh, the d.o.f. of the new scheme is the same with that of conforming FEMs.

Next, we introduce this WG methods. For the sake of simplicity and easy presentation of the main ideas, we restrict ourselves to the following model problem

$$-\nabla\cdot(a\nabla u) = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{1.1}$$

$$u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \tag{1.2}$$

where Ω is an open bounded polygonal domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$. We assume that f are given, sufficiently smooth functions, and a is a symmetric 2×2 matrix-valued function. Suppose there exists a positive number λ such that

$$\xi^t a\,\xi \geq \lambda\xi^t\xi, \quad \forall\xi\in\mathbb{R}^2,$$

where ξ is a column vector and ξ^t is the transpose of ξ.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some standard notations in Sobolev spaces and preliminaries. A weakly-defined differential operator is also introduced. The weak Galerkin finite element scheme is developed and some properties for the error analysis are discussed in Section 3. In Section 4, we shall derive an error equation for the WG approximations. Optimal-order error estimates

of H^1 and L^2 for the WG finite element approximations are also derived in this Section. The equivalence of WG formulation and its Schur complement formulation is proved in Section 5. In Section 6, numerical experiments are conducted. Finally, we present some technical estimates for quantities related to the local L^2 projections into various finite element spaces and some approximation properties which are useful in the convergence analysis in Appendix.

2. Notations and preliminaries. In this section, we shall introduce some notations used in this paper.

We use the standard Soblev space notations. For an open set $D \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|\cdot\|_{s,D}$ and $(\cdot,\cdot)_{s,D}$ stand for the $H^s(D)$ norm and inner-product, namely. We shall drop the subscripts when $s = 0$ and $D = \Omega$.

Let $\mathcal{T}_h$ be a partition of the domain consisting of polygons in two dimension or polyhedra in three dimension satisfying a set of conditions specified in [20]. Denote by $\mathcal{E}_h$ the set of all edges or at faces in $\mathcal{T}_h$. For every element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we denote by h_T its diameter and mesh size $h = \max_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T$ for $\mathcal{T}_h$.

For a given partition $\mathcal{T}_h$, $P_k(T)$ denotes a piecewise polynomial on $\mathcal{T}_h$ whose degree is no more than k on each $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Similarly, $P_k(e)$ denotes a piecewise polynomial on $\mathcal{E}_h$ whose degree is no more than k on each $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$.

Now, we define the weak finite element space as follows:

$$V_h = \{(v_0, v_b) : v_0|_T \in P_k(T), v_b|_e \in P_k(e), v_b \text{ is continuous on } \mathcal{E}_h, v_b = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}.$$

It should be noticed that v_b is single-valued on each edge, and v_b is continuous on $\mathcal{E}_h$, which means that v_b share the same value on each node of $\mathcal{T}_h$.

Similar to the definition in [19], we can define the following weak gradient operator on V_h.

DEFINITION 2.1. *For any $v_h \in V_h$, define the discrete weak gradient $\nabla_w v_h|_T \in [P_{k-1}(T)]^2$ satisfying*

$$(\nabla_w v_h, \mathbf{q})_T = -(v_0, \nabla\cdot\mathbf{q})_T + \langle v_b, \mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{n}\rangle_{\partial T}, \quad \forall \mathbf{q} \in [P_{k-1}(T)]^2, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{n}$ is the outward unit normal vector along ∂T, $(\cdot,\cdot)_T$ stands for the L^2-inner product in $L^2(T)$, and $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\partial T}$ is the inner product in $L^2(\partial T)$

3. A weak Galerkin finite element scheme. In this section, we shall propose a WG scheme for the second-order elliptic problem, and verify the wellposedness of the scheme.

For any $v_h, w_h \in V_h$, define the following bilinear forms

$$s(v_h, w_h) = \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-1}\langle v_0 - v_b, w_0 - w_b\rangle_{\partial T},$$
$$a_w(v_h, w_h) = (a\nabla_w v_h, \nabla_w w_h) + s(v_h, w_h).$$

WEAK GALERKIN ALGORITHM 1. *The weak Galerkin numerical solution of problem (1.1) -(1.2) can be obtained by seeking $u_h \in V_h$ such that*

$$a_w(u_h, v_h) = (f, v_0) \quad \forall v_h \in V_h. \tag{3.1}$$

The following semi-norm can be inducted from $a_w(\cdot,\cdot)$ directly

$$|||v_h|||^2 = a_w(v_h, v_h), \quad \forall v_h \in V_h.$$

We claim that $|||\cdot|||$ defines a norm on V_h indeed.

Notice that when $|||v_h||| = 0$, we have $\nabla_w v_h = 0$ on each $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $v_0 = v_b$ on each $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$, and it follows that $\forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (\nabla_w v_h, \nabla v_0)_T \\ &= -(v_0, \nabla \cdot \nabla v_0)_T + \langle v_b, \nabla v_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}\rangle_{\partial T} \\ &= (\nabla v_0, \nabla v_0)_T - \langle v_0 - v_b, \nabla v_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}\rangle_{\partial T} \\ &= \|\nabla v_0\|_T^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that v_0 is constant on T. With the condition that $v_b = v_0$ on each $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$ and $v_b = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we can conclude that $v_h = 0$, and thus $|||\cdot|||$ defines a norm on V_h. From this property we can arrive the wellposedness of WG scheme (3.1) directly.

THEOREM 3.1. *The WG scheme (3.1) has a unique solution.*

Next, we shall discuss some properties for the error analysis.

Define the following L^2 projections operators:

$$\begin{aligned} &Q_0 : L^2(T) \to P_k(T), \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h, \\ &Q_b : L^2(e) \to P_k(e), \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h, \\ &\mathbb{Q}_h : [L^2(T)]^2 \to [P_{k-1}(T)]^2, \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h. \end{aligned}$$

It is known that on a one-dimension edge e, for any smooth function w we can get a polynomial interpolation of degree k with $k+1$ different points. Suppose the $k+1$ interpolation points include the two endpoints of the edge, and we have the interpolation operator I_b.

Combining Q_0 and I_b, we can define

$$\tilde{Q}_h = \{Q_0, I_b\} : H^1(\Omega) \to V_h.$$

In the rest of this paper, we denote $\bar{a}$ the local $P_0(T)$ projection of a. Obviously, $\bar{a}$ is symmetric and bounded. With these projections, it arrives at the following community property.

LEMMA 3.2. *For any $\mathbf{q} \in [P_{k-1}(T)]^2$, $w \in H^1(\Omega)$,*

$$(\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h w, \mathbf{q}) = (\mathbb{Q}_h \nabla w, \mathbf{q}) + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \langle I_b w - w, \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n}\rangle_{\partial T}.$$

Proof. For any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, it follows the definition (2.1) and the integration by parts that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h w, \mathbf{q})_T \\
&= -(Q_0 w, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q})_T + \langle I_b w, \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial T} \\
&= -(Q_0 w, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q})_T + \langle w, \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial T} + \langle I_b w - w, \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial T} \\
&= (\nabla w, \mathbf{q})_T + \langle I_b w - w, \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial T} \\
&= (\mathbb{Q}_h \nabla w, \mathbf{q})_T + \langle I_b w - w, \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial T}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Summing over all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and the proof is completed. □

4. Error analysis. In this section, we shall present the H^1 and L^2 errors of the weak Galerkin numerical scheme (3.1) with optimal orders.

Denote the error $e_h = \tilde{Q}_h u - u_h$, and we shall show the error equation for e_h.

LEMMA 4.1. *Suppose $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ is the solution of (1.1)- (1.2), and u_h is the WG numerical solution of (3.1). Then for any $v_h \in V_h$,*

$$
a_w(\tilde{Q}_h u - u_h, v_h) = l(u, v_h),
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
l(u, v_h) = &(a\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h u - \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u), \nabla_w v_h) \\
&- \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \langle (\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u) - a\nabla u) \cdot \mathbf{n}, v_0 - v_b \rangle_{\partial T} + s(\tilde{Q}_h u, v_h).
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. For any $v_h \in V_h$, it follows the integration by parts that

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_w(u_h, v_h) &= (f, v_0) \\
&= (a\nabla u, \nabla v_0) - \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \langle a\nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}, v_0 \rangle_{\partial T} \\
&= (a\nabla u, \nabla v_0) - \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \langle a\nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}, v_0 - v_b \rangle_{\partial T}. \qquad (4.1)
\end{aligned}
$$

From the definition (2.1), we can obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(a\nabla u, \nabla v_0) \\
&= (\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u), \nabla v_0) \\
&= (\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u), \nabla_w v_h) + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \langle \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u) \cdot \mathbf{n}, v_0 - v_b \rangle_{\partial T} \qquad (4.2)
\end{aligned}
$$

Substituting (4.2) into (4.1), we get

$$
a_w(u_h, v_h) = (\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u), \nabla_w v_h) + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \langle (\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u) - a\nabla u) \cdot \mathbf{n}, v_0 - v_b \rangle_{\partial T}. \qquad (4.3)
$$

Notice that

$$
a_w(\tilde{Q}_h u, v_h) = (a\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h u, \nabla_w v_h) + s(\tilde{Q}_h u, v_h). \qquad (4.4)
$$

Subtracting (4.3) from (4.4), we have

$$a_w(\tilde{Q}_h u - u_h, v_h) = (a\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h u - \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u), \nabla_w v_h) \\ - \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle (\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u) - a\nabla u)\cdot \mathbf{n}, v_0 - v_b\rangle_{\partial T} + s(\tilde{Q}_h u, v_h),$$

which completes the proof. □

With the error equation and the technique tools in Appendix, we can arrive at the estimate for the H^1 error.

THEOREM 4.2. *Suppose $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)\cap H^{k+1}(\Omega)$ is the solution of (1.1)- (1.2), and $u_h \in V_h$ is the WG numerical solution of (3.1). The following estimate holds true,*

$$|||\tilde{Q}_h u - u_h||| \le Ch^k \|u\|_{k+1}.$$

Proof. Take $v_h = \tilde{Q}_h u - u_h$ in Lemma 4.1, then from Lemma 7.6 we can obtain

$$|||\tilde{Q}_h u - u_h|||^2 = l(u, \tilde{Q}_h u - u_h) \\ \le Ch^k |||\tilde{Q}_h u - u_h|||,$$

which completes the proof. □

Next, we shall show the optimal L^2 error order using the well-known Nistche's argument. Consider the following dual problem: find $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$-\nabla\cdot(a\nabla\varphi) = e_0. \tag{4.5}$$

Assume the dual problem (4.5) has H^2 regularity, i.e.

$$\|\varphi\|_2 \le C\|e_0\|. \tag{4.6}$$

THEOREM 4.3. *Suppose $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)\cap H^{k+1}(\Omega)$ is the solution of (1.1)- (1.2), $u_h \in V_h$ is the WG numerical solution of (3.1), and the dual problem (4.5) satisfies the regularity assumption (4.6). The following estimate holds true,*

$$\|Q_0 u - u_0\| \le Ch^{k+1}\|u\|_{k+1}.$$

Proof. Testing equation (4.5) by e_0 and we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|e_0\|^2 \\ &= (a\nabla\varphi, \nabla e_0) - \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \nabla\varphi\cdot\mathbf{n}, e_0\rangle_{\partial T} \\ &= (\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla\varphi), \nabla e_0) - \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \nabla\varphi\cdot\mathbf{n}, e_0 - e_b\rangle_{\partial T} \\ &= (\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla\varphi), \nabla_w e_h) + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle (\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla\varphi) - a\nabla\varphi)\cdot\mathbf{n}, e_0 - e_b\rangle_{\partial T}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Similar to the derivative of formula (4.4), we have

$$a_w(\tilde{Q}_h\varphi, e_h) = (a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi, \nabla_w e_h) + s(\tilde{Q}_h\varphi, e_h). \tag{4.8}$$

Subtracting (4.8) from (4.7) yields

$$\|e_0\|^2 = a_w(\tilde{Q}_h\varphi, e_h) - l(\varphi, e_h).$$

By substituting $v_h = \tilde{Q}_h\varphi$ in Lemma 4.1 we get

$$a_w(e_h, \tilde{Q}_h\varphi) = l(u, \tilde{Q}_h\varphi),$$

which implies

$$\|e_0\|^2 = l(u, \tilde{Q}_h\varphi) - l(\varphi, e_h). \tag{4.9}$$

From Lemma 7.6 and (4.6), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} l(\varphi, e_h) &\le Ch|||e_h|||\|\varphi\|_2 \\ &\le Ch^{k+1}\|u\|_{k+1}\|e_0\|. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Now we just need to estimate the following three terms of $l(u, \tilde{Q}_h\varphi)$. As to the first term, we split it into two formulas and estimate them separately as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &(a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h u - \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u), \nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi) \\ =\ &(\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h u - \nabla u, a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi) \\ =\ &(\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h u - \nabla u, a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi - \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi)) \\ &+(\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h u - \nabla u, \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi)) \\ =\ &(\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h u - \nabla u, a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi - \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi)) \\ &+(\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h u - \mathbb{Q}_h\nabla u, \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi)). \end{aligned}$$

For the first formula, from Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 7.5 we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &|(\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h u - \nabla u, a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi - \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi))| \\ \le\ &\|\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h u - \nabla u\|\|a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi - \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi)\| \\ \le\ &Ch^k\|u\|_{k+1}\|\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi\|_1 \\ \le\ &Ch^{k+1}\|u\|_{k+1}\|\varphi\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

As to the second formula, it follows Lemmas 3.2 and 7.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h u - \mathbb{Q}_h\nabla u, \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi)) \\ =\ &\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\langle I_b u - u, \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi)\cdot\mathbf{n}\rangle_{\partial T} \\ =\ &\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\langle I_b u - u, \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h\varphi - a\nabla\varphi)\cdot\mathbf{n}\rangle_{\partial T} \\ &+\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\langle I_b u - u, (\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla\varphi) - a\nabla\varphi)\cdot\mathbf{n}\rangle_{\partial T} \\ \le\ &Ch^{k+1}\|u\|_{k+1}\|\varphi\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, from Lemma 7.3 and the trace inequality we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\langle(\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u)-a\nabla u)\cdot\mathbf{n},Q_0\varphi-I_b\varphi\rangle_{\partial T}\\
&\le C\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T\|\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u)-a\nabla u\|^2_{\partial T}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\|Q_0\varphi-\varphi\|^2_{\partial T}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\quad+C\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla u)-a\nabla u\|^2_{T}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\|\varphi-I_b\varphi\|^2_{\partial T}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\le Ch^{k+1}\|u\|_{k+1}\|\varphi\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the third term we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&s(\tilde{Q}_hu,\tilde{Q}_h\varphi)\\
&=\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\langle Q_0u-I_bu,Q_0\varphi-I_b\varphi\rangle_{\partial T}\\
&=\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\langle Q_0u-u,Q_0\varphi-\varphi\rangle_{\partial T}+\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\langle u-I_bu,Q_0\varphi-\varphi\rangle_{\partial T}\\
&\quad+\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\langle Q_0u-u,\varphi-I_b\varphi\rangle_{\partial T}+\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\langle u-I_bu,\varphi-I_b\varphi\rangle_{\partial T}\\
&\le Ch^{k+1}\|u\|_{k+1}\|\varphi\|_2,
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
l(u,\tilde{Q}_h\varphi)&\le Ch^{k+1}\|u\|_{k+1}\|\varphi\|_2\\
&\le Ch^{k+1}\|u\|_{k+1}\|e_0\|.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.11}$$

By substituting (4.10) and (4.11) into (4.9), the proof is completed. □

5. Schur Complement. In this section, we shall show the technique in practical which can eliminate the degree of freedoms of v_0, and then only the degree of freedoms of v_b are involved in the total linear system.

Let $u_h=\{u_0,u_b\}$ be the solution of the WG scheme (3.1), then u_h satisfies the following equation

$$a_w(u_h,v_h)=(f,v_0),\quad\forall v_h\in V_h.$$

This equation can be rewritten as the following form

$$a_w(u_h,v_h)=(f,v_0),\quad\forall v_h=\{v_0,0\}\in V_h,\tag{5.1}$$

$$a_w(u_h,v_h)=0,\quad\forall v_h=\{0,v_b\}\in V_h.\tag{5.2}$$

For given u_b on ∂T, one can solve equation (5.1) for the u_0, and note

$$u_0=D(u_b,f).\tag{5.3}$$

It should be noticed that $D(u_b,f)$ can be calculated elementwisely. We can solve the local problem

$$a_w(u_h,v_0)=(f,v_0),\quad\forall v_0\in P_k(T),\tag{5.4}$$

and get

$$u_0 = D_T(u_b, f). \tag{5.5}$$

Then we substitute (5.3) into (5.2) and get the following equation

$$a_w(\{D(u_b, f), u_b\}, v_h) = 0, \quad \forall v_h = \{0, v_b\} \in V_h. \tag{5.6}$$

Thus we can conclude a complement for the WG scheme as follows.

Step 1. Solve equation (5.4) on each element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and get $u_0 = D(u_b, f)$.

Step 2. Solve the global system (5.2) for u_b.

Step 3. Recover u_0 by $u_0 = D_T(u_b, f)$ on each element.

When we take the uniform triangle mesh on the unit square and set $k = 1$, the degree of freedom of different schemes are listed in Table 5.

TABLE 5.1
Degree of freedom of different schemes.

h	WG	CWG	$WG\ Schur$	$CWG\ schur$	CG
1/8	592	465	208	81	81
1/16	2336	1825	800	289	289
1/32	9280	7233	3136	1089	1089
1/64	36992	28801	12416	4225	4225
1/128	147712	114945	49408	16641	16641

WG stands for the degree of freedom in the scheme in [15], CWG stands for scheme (3.1), $WG\ Schur$ stands for the scheme in [15] with Schur complement, $CWG\ Schur$ stands for scheme (3.1) with Schur complement, and CG stands for the conforming Galerkin method.

6. Numerical experiment. In this section, we shall present some numerical results to show the efficiency and accuracy of the WG scheme.

Example 1 Consider the problem (1.1) - (1.2) on the unit square $\Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$. The analytic solution u is set to be $u = \sin(\pi x)\sin(\pi y)$, the right side and the Dirichlet boundary condition is computed to match the exact solution. In this numerical experiment, the uniform triangle mesh is employed. We can conclude from Table 6 that the convergence rate for H^1 and L^2 errors are of $O(h)$ and $O(h^2)$, respectively. This is coincide with the theoretical analysis in this paper.

Example 2 Consider the problem (1.1)- (1.2) on the unit square $\Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$. The analytic solution u is set to be $u = x(1 - x)y(1 - y)$, the right-hand side side and the Dirichlet boundary condition is computed to match the exact solution. In this numerical experiment, the uniform rectangle mesh is employed. We can conclude from Table 6 that the convergence rate for H^1 and L^2 errors are of $O(h)$ and $O(h^2)$, respectively. This is coincide with the theoretical results.

7. Appendix. In this section, we shall give some technique tools which are applied in the error estimate.

TABLE 6.1
k=1 uniform convergence rates.

h	dof	$\|\|\|\tilde{Q}_h u - u_h\|\|\|$	order	$\|Q_0 u - u_0\|$	order
1/8	4.6500e+02	3.8193e-01		2.6130e-02	
1/16	1.8250e+03	1.9065e-01	1.0024	6.5871e-03	1.9880
1/32	7.2330e+03	9.5281e-02	1.0006	1.6503e-03	1.9969
1/64	2.8801e+04	4.7635e-02	1.0002	4.1281e-04	1.9992
1/128	1.1495e+05	2.3817e-02	1.0000	1.0322e-04	1.9998

TABLE 6.2
k=1 not uniform convergence rates.

h	dof	$\|\|\|\tilde{Q}_h u - u_h\|\|\|$	order	$\|Q_0 u - u_0\|$	order
1/8	7.5900e+02	2.7721e-01		9.9566e-03	
1/16	3.0850e+03	1.3806e-01	1.0056	2.5059e-03	1.9903
1/32	1.2259e+04	7.0399e-02	0.9717	6.0741e-04	2.0446
1/64	4.9521e+04	3.5100e-02	1.0041	1.5030e-04	2.0149
1/128	1.9978e+05	1.7449e-02	1.0084	3.6918e-05	2.0254

TABLE 6.3
k=1 uniform rectangle mesh convergence rates.

h	dof	$\|\|\|\tilde{Q}_h u - u_h\|\|\|$	order	$\|Q_0 u - u_0\|$	order
1/8	2.7300e+02	2.9292e-02		1.8766e-03	
1/16	1.0570e+03	1.4587e-02	1.0059	4.8858e-04	1.9415
1/32	4.1610e+03	7.2859e-03	1.0015	1.1926e-04	2.0344
1/64	1.6513e+04	3.6420e-03	1.0004	3.1107e-05	1.9389
1/128	6.5793e+04	1.8209e-03	1.0001	7.5782e-06	2.0373

The trace inequality and the inverse inequality for the weak Galerkin method are proved in [20].

LEMMA 7.1. *Assume that the partition $\mathcal{T}_h$ satisfies the assumptions (A1), (A2), and (A3) as specified in [20]. Then, there exists a constant C such that for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and edge/face $e \in \partial T$, we have for any $\theta \in H^1(T)$,*

$$\|\theta\|_e^p \leq C h_T^{-1} (\|\theta\|_T^p + h_T^p \|\nabla \theta\|_T^p). \tag{7.1}$$

LEMMA 7.2. *Assume that the partition $\mathcal{T}_h$ satisfies the assumptions (A1), (A2), (A3) and (A4) as specified in [20]. Then, there exists a constant $C(k)$ such that for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we have for any $\varphi \in P_k(T)$,*

$$\|\nabla \varphi\|_T \leq C(n) h_T^{-1} \|\varphi\|_T. \tag{7.2}$$

The following estimate of interpolation error plays an essential role in the error estimate.

LEMMA 7.3. *Assume that the partition $\mathcal{T}_h$ satisfies the assumptions (A1), (A2), (A3) and (A4) as specified in [20]. For any $w \in H^{k+1}(\Omega)$, the following estimate*

holds true

$$\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|w-I_b w\|^2_{\partial T}\le Ch^{2k+1}\|w\|^2_{k+1}.$$

Proof. For any edge $e\in\partial T$, according to assumption (A3), there exists a triangle P_e, whose base is identical to e and height is proportional to h_T. Then there exists a interpolation operator I_{Pe} onto $P_k(P_e)$ which contains all the interpolation points of I_b. It follows the trace inequality (7.1) and the property of interpolation operator that for any $w\in H^{k+2}(T)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|w-I_b w\|^2_e\\
=&\|w-I_{Pe}w\|^2_e\\
\le& C(h_{P_e}^{-1}\|w-I_{Pe}w\|^2_{P_e}+h_{P_e}\|\nabla(w-I_{Pe}w)\|^2_{P_e})\\
\le& Ch^{2k+1}_{P_e}\|w\|^2_{k+1,P_e}\\
\le& Ch^{2k+1}_T\|w\|^2_{k+1,T}.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing over all $T\in\mathcal{T}_h$ and the proof is completed. □

With Lemma 7.3, we can describe the difference between $\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h w$ and $\mathbb{Q}_h\nabla w$ in the following lemma.

LEMMA 7.4. *Assume that the partition $\mathcal{T}_h$ satisfies the assumptions (A1), (A2), (A3) and (A4) as specified in [20]. For any $w\in H^{k+1}(\Omega)$, the following estimate holds true*

$$\|\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h w-\mathbb{Q}_h\nabla w\|\le Ch^k\|w\|_{k+1}.$$

Proof. It follows Lemma 3.2 that for any $\mathbf{q}\in[P_{k-1}(T)]^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h w-\mathbb{Q}_h\nabla w,\mathbf{q})\\
=&\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\langle I_b w-w,\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{n}\rangle_{\partial T}\\
\le& C\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|I_b w-w\|^2_{\partial T}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|\mathbf{q}\|^2_{\partial T}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

From the trace inequality and the inverse inequality, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|\mathbf{q}\|^2_{\partial T}\\
\le& C\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\|\mathbf{q}\|^2_T+C\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T\|\nabla\mathbf{q}\|^2_T\\
\le& C\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\|\mathbf{q}\|^2_T.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $\mathbf{q}=\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h w-\mathbb{Q}_h\nabla w$ and applying Lemma 7.3 yield

$$\|\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h w-\mathbb{Q}_h\nabla w\|^2\le Ch^k\|w\|_{k+1}\|\nabla_w\tilde{Q}_h w-\mathbb{Q}_h\nabla w\|,$$

which completes the proof. ∎

LEMMA 7.5. *Assume that the partition $\mathcal{T}_h$ satisfies the assumptions (A1), (A2), (A3) and (A4) as specified in [20]. For any $w \in H^2(\Omega)$, the following estimate holds true*

$$\|\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h w\|_1 \leq C\|w\|_2.$$

Proof. When $w \in P_1(T)$, from definition 2.1 we know $w = \tilde{Q}_h w$ and $\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h w = \nabla w$, so that

$$\|\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h w - \nabla w\|_1 = 0, \quad \forall w \in P_1(T).$$

Then, from Bramble-Hilbert Theorem it follows that

$$\|\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h w - \nabla w\|_1 \leq Ch\|w\|_2, \quad \forall w \in H^2(T).$$

From the triangle inequality we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h w\|_1 \\ \leq\ &\|\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h w - \nabla w\|_1 + \|\nabla w\|_1 \\ \leq\ &C\|w\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. ∎

In order to give the error estimate, we need to estimate the remainder of the error equation in Lemma 4.1.

LEMMA 7.6. *Suppose $w \in H^{k+1}(\Omega)$ and $v_h \in V_h$, then the following estimates hold true*

$$\begin{aligned} (a\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h w - \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla w), \nabla_w v_h) &\leq Ch^k\|w\|_{k+1}|\!|\!|v_h|\!|\!|, \\ \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle (\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla w) - a\nabla w)\cdot \mathbf{n}, v_0 - v_b\rangle_{\partial T} &\leq Ch^k\|w\|_{k+1}|\!|\!|v_h|\!|\!|, \\ s(\tilde{Q}_h w, v_h) &\leq Ch^k\|w\|_{k+1}|\!|\!|v_h|\!|\!|. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$l(w, v_h) \leq Ch^k\|w\|_{k+1}|\!|\!|v_h|\!|\!|.$$

Proof. For the first inequality, from the triangle inequality and Lemma 7.3 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &(a\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h w - \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla w), \nabla_w v_h) \\ \leq\ &\|a\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h w - \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla w)\|\|\nabla_w v_h\| \\ \leq\ &\|a\nabla_w \tilde{Q}_h w - a(\mathbb{Q}_h\nabla w)\|\|v_h\|| + \|a(\mathbb{Q}_h\nabla w) - a\nabla w\|\|v_h\|| \\ &+\|a\nabla w - \mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla w)\|\|v_h\|| \\ \leq\ &Ch^k\|w\|_{k+1}|\!|\!|v_h|\!|\!|. \end{aligned}$$

As the second inequality, from the properties of projection operator and the trace inequality we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\langle(\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla w)-a\nabla w)\cdot\mathbf{n},v_0-v_b\rangle_{\partial T}\\
&\leq C\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T\|\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla w)-a\nabla w\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\|v_0-v_b\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\leq C\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|\mathbb{Q}_h(a\nabla w)-a\nabla w\|_T^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\|v_0-v_b\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\leq Ch^k\|w\|_{k+1}|\!|\!|v_h|\!|\!|.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the last inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&s(\tilde{Q}_hw,v_h)\\
&=\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\langle Q_0w-I_bw,v_0-v_b\rangle_{\partial T}\\
&=\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\langle Q_0w-w,v_0-v_b\rangle_{\partial T}+\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\langle w-I_bw,v_0-v_b\rangle_{\partial T}\\
&\leq C\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\|Q_0w-w\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\|v_0-v_b\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\quad+C\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\|w-I_bw\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\|v_0-v_b\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\leq Ch^k\|w\|_{k+1}|\!|\!|v_h|\!|\!|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

REFERENCES

[1] P. Alotto, A. Bertoni, I. Perugia, and D. Schotzau, Discontinuous finite element methods for the simulation of rotating electrical machines, COMPEL, 20 (2001), pp. 448-462.

[2] D. Arnold, F. Brezzi, B. Cockburn, and D. Marini, Discontinuous Galerkin methods for elliptic problems, in Discontinuous Galerkin Methods. Theory, Computation and Applications, B. Cockburn, G. E. Karniadakis, and C.-W. Shu, eds., Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci. Engrg. 11, Springer-Verlag, NewY ork, 2000, pp. 89-101.

[3] R. Becker and P. Hansbo, Discontinuous Galerkin methods for convection-diffusion problems with arbitrary Peclet number, in Numerical Mathematics and Advanced Applications, Proceedings of ENUMATH 99, P. Neittaanmaki, T. Tiihonen, and P. Tarvainen, eds., World Scientific, River Edge, NJ, 2000, pp. 100-109.

[4] L. Chen, Equivalence of weak Galerkin methods and virtual element methods for elliptic equations, arXiv: 1503.04700.

[5] B. Cockburn, G. Karniadakis, and C. W. Shu, The development of discontinuous Galerkin methods, in: B. Cockburn, G.E. Karniadakis, C.-W. Shu (Eds.), First International Symposium on Discontinuous Galerkin Methods, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000, pp. 5-50.

[6] B. Cockburn, J. Gopalakrishnan and R. Lazarov, Unified hybridization of discontinuous Galerkin, mixed, and continuous Galerkin methods for second order elliptic problems, SIAM J. Numer. Anal, 47 (2009), pp. 1319-1365 .

[7] R. Courant, Variational methods for the solution of problems of equilibrium and vibrations, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 49 (1943), pp. 1-23.

[8] R.M. Kirby, S.J. Sherwin and B. Cockburn, To CG or to HDG: A comparative study, J. Sci. Comput., 51 (2012), pp. 183-212.
[9] L. Mu, J. Wang, Y. Wang, and X. Ye, A computational study of the weak Galerkin method for second order elliptic quations. Numerical Algorithms, 63(4)(2013), pp. 753-777.
[10] L. Mu, J. Wang, Y. Wang, and X. Ye, A weak Galerkin mixed finite element method for biharmonic equations, Numerical Solution of Partial Differential Equations: Theory, Algorithms, and Their Applications, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics and Statistics, 45(2013), pp. 247-277.
[11] L. Mu, J. Wang, and X. Ye, A stable numerical algorithm for the Brinkman equations by weak Galerkin finite element methods, J. Comput. Physics 273(2014), pp. 327-342.
[12] L. Mu, J. Wang, and X. Ye, Weak Galerkin finite element methods for the biharmonic equation on polytopal meshes, Numerical Methods for PDEs, 30 (2014), pp. 1003-1029.
[13] L. Mu, J. Wang, and X. Ye, Weak Galerkin finite element methods on polytopal meshes.International Journal of Numerical Analysis and Modeling, 12 (2015), pp. 31-53.
[14] L. Mu, J. Wang, and X. Ye, A weak Galerkin finite element methods with polynomial reduction, arXiv:1304.6481, J. Comp. and Appl. Math., 285 (2015), pp. 45-58.
[15] L. Mu, J. Wang, and X. Ye, A weak Galerkin finite element method with polynomial reduction, arXiv:1304.648.
[16] L. Mu, J. Wang, X. Ye, and S. Zhang, A C^0-weak Galerkin finite element method for the biharmonic equation. Journal of Scientific Computing, 59(2)(2014), pp. 473-495.
[17] L. Mu, J. Wang, X. Ye, and S. Zhang, A weak Galerkin finite element method for the Maxwell equations, Journal of Scientific Computing, accepted. 2015.
[18] G. Strang and G. Fix An Analysis of The Finite Element Method. Prentice Hall. (1973).
[19] J. Wang and X. Ye, A weak Galerkin finite element method for second-order elliptic problems, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 241 (2013), pp. 103-115.
[20] J. Wang and X. Ye, A weak Galerkin mixed finite element method for second-order elliptic problems, Math. Comp. 83 (2014), pp. 2101-2126.
[21] Q. Zhai, R. Zhang, and X. Wang, A Hybridized Weak Galerkin Finite Element Scheme for the Stokes Equations, Science China Mathematics, accepted.
[22] R. Zhang and Q. Zhai, A Weak Galerkin Finite Element Scheme for the Biharmonic Equations by Using Polynomials of Reduced Order, J Sci Comput, 64(2)(2015), pp. 559-585 .
[23] R. Zhang and Q. Zhai, A new weak Galerkin finite element scheme for the biharmonic equations by using polynomials of reduced order, J. Sci. Comput. 64(2)(2015), pp. 559-585.